

BOOKS BURNED FOR BOTH.

Damaging Evidence Produced Against Becker and Finn.

But the Gerry Agents Affect to Be Confident of Acquittal.

Sophie Martens' Allegations Borne Out by Other Witnesses.

The trial of Edward J. Becker and William A. Finn, the Gerry society agents who are charged with compounding a nuisance in burning books from Mrs. Sophie Martens, whom they had arrested on the charge of keeping a disorderly house at No. 4111 Broadway, was continued today before Judge Fitzgerald in Part II of the Court of General Sessions.

The story of the arrest of the Gerry agents by Capt. Cross of the 10th district street station, on the night of April 28 is familiar to readers of THE EVENING WORLD. The original charge when they were arrested in Essex Market was extortion, but this was subsequently amended, and the grand jury returned an indictment for compounding a nuisance.

Mrs. Sophie Martens testified that Becker, Finn and Officer Davis, of the Gerry society, arrested her and three inmates of her house April 28, and on the way to the station-house they could not find things for her. When Becker looked her up at Essex Market he told her that Finn would be around to see her.

Finn called at her house and said he would settle the case for \$500, which was to be paid at 100 Broadway street and second avenue the next day. She raised \$500 the next day but decided it would be better to let Capt. Cross about it.

The captain arranged a trap to catch the alleged blackmailing Gerry agents. He marked the place, tied them up in a roll and told Mrs. Martens to pay the money out of the street.

Mrs. Martens met Finn and Becker according to arrangement. She handed the money to Becker and dropped a handkerchief, upon which Detective Smith rushed across the street and, drawing a revolver, ordered Becker and Finn, who had started to run, to halt.

Becker stopped, but Finn continued running and Smith fired at him. Policeman Quinn, of the East 7th street station, caught Finn and brought him back to where Becker was in custody of Capt. Cross and Detective Smith.

Capt. Cross testified to the arrangements for the arrest, as related, and that Finn asked him to "let up" on him as no money was taken from the woman.

Detective Smith swore that he found the roll of marked bills after the arrest in the street, near a cartwheel, where it had apparently been thrown by Becker.

The accused agents watch the trial anxiously, frequently consulting with the counsel, young William Travers Jerome, who defended Carlisle Harris, the convicted witness.

Becker has been out on bail, but Finn has been locked up in the Tombs since his arraignment at Essex Market. To their counsel, Becker and Finn deny the charge of compounding a nuisance, but the evidence so far presented has been so strong that the police assert that Becker and Finn had been engaged in levying blackmail upon the owners of other houses in the district, and it is estimated that some of these people will be called as witnesses by the prosecution.

It was 11:30 o'clock when the trial was resumed today. Judge Fitzgerald, after two weeks of evidence in the district court by Finn upon which the warrant for Sophie Martens' arrest was granted by Justice Tamm.

Mrs. Martens objected, as he could not understand what object the district court had in view. Judge Fitzgerald overruled the objection. The warrant issued upon the affidavits was, she testified, obtained to her objection overruled. Then the Finn affidavit identifying Mrs. Martens as a disorderly housekeeper and another exception granted.

Mrs. Martens suggested that the record of Mrs. Martens' arrest be examined in the very same manner. Mr. Weeks declined and the papers were put in by the defense.

Policeman Hugh Davis, of the East 7th street station, was the first witness called. He testified to seeing Finn and Becker on his post at Twenty-third street on the night of April 28. He was well acquainted with both and after exchanging a few words with them they entered a room on the southwest corner of Twenty-third street and Broadway.

A short time after he heard a shot and seeing Finn running, he stopped him and took him into custody. He testified that Becker was in custody of Capt. Cross and Detective Smith.

Detective Smith after the prisoners were taken to the district street station, was ordered to put the money in a bag and take it to the money supposed to have been thrown away by Becker.

Lieut. Cross examined him and he was not present when the money was found and his presence in the money was considered. He testified that he had been in the room when the money was found.

Next, Edward J. Jenkins, of the Gerry society, and Arthur J. Becker, of the same society, were called. He identified a report submitted by Finn April 28, which was the report of Sophie Martens' house. The report was placed in evidence.

Next, Detective Smith was called and he had no other report pertaining to that house alone, but upon Mr. Weeks' request produced a report made August 1, 1891.

Judge Fitzgerald sustained an objection to anything being said about the report, as it had no bearing upon the present case, and on the same ground he sustained an objection to a question as to whether the report was true or not.

Next, Detective Smith was called and he had no other report pertaining to that house alone, but upon Mr. Weeks' request produced a report made August 1, 1891.

Judge Fitzgerald sustained an objection to anything being said about the report, as it had no bearing upon the present case, and on the same ground he sustained an objection to a question as to whether the report was true or not.

Next, Detective Smith was called and he had no other report pertaining to that house alone, but upon Mr. Weeks' request produced a report made August 1, 1891.

Judge Fitzgerald sustained an objection to anything being said about the report, as it had no bearing upon the present case, and on the same ground he sustained an objection to a question as to whether the report was true or not.

Next, Detective Smith was called and he had no other report pertaining to that house alone, but upon Mr. Weeks' request produced a report made August 1, 1891.

SLOINEY'S TRIAL FOR MURDER.

Bob Lyons' Old Mother Tells of His Dying Statement.

She Contradicts Her Testimony Given at the Inquest.

Assistant District Attorney William Sloiney, who is prosecuting the case of the People against Michael T. Sloiney for the murder of Robert Lyons before Judge Ingram in the Court of Over and Terminer today.

Mrs. Sloiney, who is the mother of the defendant, was called to the stand today to testify to the reading of the indictment for murder in the first degree with malice aforethought, which was read to her by the court.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

The indictment was read to her by the court, and she testified that she had read it to her son, Michael T. Sloiney, who is the defendant in the case.

SIT TONIGHT.

The National Committee Disposed of All These Cases in a Few Hours.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

The delegates from Kansas are enjoying this morning a little story given out last night by Henry G. Burleigh to the effect that the majority of the Kansas delegation had gone over to the Harrison side.

CONKIN OWNED THE "ZOO."

Or at Least He Managed It as if He Did.

Commissioners of Accounts and Daily.

Commissioners of Accounts and Daily. They conducted the investigation into the management of the central Park menagerie and Park affairs in general, presented to Mayor Grant this morning their report, with findings and recommendations.

They recommended the dismissal of Property Clerk Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, "eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants" by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress.

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

The commissioners begin by stating: "It is with some hesitation we make this, our final report, for judging by the late of our special report of April 12, 1892, recommending the dismissal of Van Valkenburgh and Foreman Louis Plank, of Central Park, 'eliminating the jurisdiction over the purchase of plants' by Capt. Parsons, but not a word was said about prosecuting except of the Managers W. A. Conkin and Head Keeper Charles W. Weldon, who resigned when the investigation was in progress."

DAILEY IS INDICTED.

Two Bills Found Against Him by the Grand Jury To-Day.

One Is for Criminally Assaulting Young Mamie Hannan.

The Other is for the Assault Made by Him on Her Mother.

The case of Roundsmann Matthew P. Dailey, accused of having criminally assaulted pretty sixteen-year-old Mamie Hannan in the back room of the Gellert saloon at Pitt and Broome streets, on the night of March 29 last, was presented to the Grand Jury at its extraordinary term this morning.

The matter was taken up at 11 o'clock, and the first witness introduced was Mrs. Annie Hannan, Mamie's mother. She testified that on March 29 last, at 11:30, when Mamie herself went to the saloon.

The matter was taken up at 11 o'clock, and the first witness introduced was Mrs. Annie Hannan, Mamie's mother. She testified that on March 29 last, at 11:30, when Mamie herself went to the saloon.

The matter was taken up at 11 o'clock, and the first witness introduced was Mrs. Annie Hannan, Mamie's mother. She testified that on March 29 last, at 11:30, when Mamie herself went to the saloon.

The matter was taken up at 11 o'clock, and the first witness introduced was Mrs. Annie Hannan, Mamie's mother. She testified that on March 29 last, at 11:30, when Mamie herself went to the saloon.

The matter was taken up at 11 o'clock, and the first witness introduced was Mrs. Annie Hannan, Mamie's mother. She testified that on March 29 last, at 11:30, when Mamie herself went to the saloon.

The matter was taken up at 11 o'clock, and the first witness introduced was Mrs. Annie Hannan, Mamie's mother. She testified that on March 29 last, at 11:30, when Mamie herself went to the saloon.

The matter was taken up at 11 o'clock, and the first witness introduced was Mrs. Annie Hannan, Mamie's mother. She testified that on March 29 last, at 11:30, when Mamie herself went to the saloon.

The matter was taken up at 11 o'clock, and the first witness introduced was Mrs. Annie Hannan, Mamie's mother. She testified that on March 29 last, at 11:30, when Mamie herself went to the saloon.

The matter was taken up at 11 o'clock, and the first witness introduced was Mrs. Annie Hannan, Mamie's mother. She testified that on March 29 last, at 11:30, when Mamie herself went to the saloon.

The matter was taken up at 11 o'clock, and the first witness introduced was Mrs. Annie Hannan, Mamie's mother. She testified that on March 29 last, at 11: